REMARKS

1. Present Status of Patent Application

In response to the non-final Office Action dated September 13, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the following amendments and remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

2. Telephone Interview

Applicants first wish to express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Ramakrishnaiah spent with Applicants' Attorney, Charles W. Griggers during a telephone discussion on November 30, 2006 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During this conversation, Applicants' representative presented suggested amendments and arguments that were believed to overcome the cited references and the cited references were discussed. However, a consensus was not reached during this conversation. It was the Examiner's contention that *Archer* suggests that an ISP may provide routing instructions to a circuit-switched network which would then allegedly anticipate Applicants' proposed amendments, which are contained herein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner carefully consider this response and the amendments contained herein which show that the cited art does not suggest or teach all the claimed features.

3. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10, 14-16, 21-22, 24-25, and 30-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Archer* (U.S. Patent No. 6,683,870) in view of *Pepper* (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,700). Claims 6, 9, 20, and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Archer* in view of *Pepper* in further view of *Reding* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0213212 A1). Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Archer* in view of *Pepper* in further view of *Cermak* (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,095). Claims 13, 17-18, and 26-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Archer* in

view of *Pepper* in further view of *Balasuriya* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0041048). Claims 19 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Archer* in view of *Pepper* in further view of *Balasuriya* in further view of *Reding*. Claims 11-12, 23, and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Archer* in view of *Pepper* in further view *Cermak*.

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

> An intelligent interactive call handling system, comprising:
> a central office operable to trigger a query responsive to receiving a call request for a called party at a called party telephone number;
> ***call-handling device coupled to the central office, the call-handling device operable to receive the query, and trigger an internet call routing query; and***
> ***an internet call routing system coupled to the call-handling device, the internet call routing system being operable to receive the internet call routing query, send a notification of the incoming call to the called party at a plurality of registered communication devices that the called party is detected to be present, the notification prompting the called party for instruction for handling the incoming call, in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and instruct the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time, wherein the call-handling device forwards the instructions from the internet call routing system to the central office.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Archer* in view of *Pepper* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "call-handling device coupled to the central office, the call-handling device operable to receive the query, and trigger an internet call routing query; and an internet call routing system coupled to the call-handling device, the internet call routing system being operable to receive the internet call routing query, send a notification of the incoming call to the called party at a plurality of registered communication devices that the called party is detected to be present, the notification prompting the called party for instruction

for handling the incoming call, in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and instruct the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time, wherein the call-handling device forwards the instructions from the internet call routing system to the central office," as recited and emphasized above.

For example, *Pepper* describes that "[i]n a second illustrative embodiment, the service control module 306 functionality is a main function in the IP 107 that is invoked by the SCP 105. This mapping may require a minimum of communications between the SCP and the IP, where the SCP is only involved at the start-up of the call. This mapping assumes that the IP can originate an outgoing call (to the subscriber and/or the subscriber's voice mail system, if this is a completely separate system) and to transfer the caller to the subscriber at the subscriber's request. Multiple IPs may be provided to support all of the system functions (e.g., one handling the client interactions and one handling the subscriber's interactions through his PDA)." Col. 8, lines 5-17 (Emphasis added).

Pepper does not teach or suggest a "call-handling device coupled to the central office, the call-handling device operable to receive the query, and trigger an internet call routing query" and an internet call routing system coupled to the call-handling device, the internet call routing system being operable to receive the internet call routing query, send a notification of the incoming call to the called party at a plurality of registered communication devices that the called party is detected to be present, the notification prompting the called party for instruction for handling the incoming call, in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and instruct the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time, wherein the call-handling device forwards the instructions from the internet call routing system to the central office," as recited in claim 1.

Further, *Pepper* discloses "giving a single contact number to his clients" where the disclosed system connects a call for the single contact number, the call is answered by a TNI, and then may originate an outgoing call to another number. *See* col. 6, lines

12-17 and col. 8, lines 5-17. Likewise, *Archer* discloses a find-me system, where a caller dials a single telephone number. The call is then directed to a find-me service processor. Server processor routes call to a device via digitized packets over packet-switched network 130, whereby "This system also reduces switch traffic for the telephone companies by letting Internet service providers do the routing, in effect turning the Internet service providers into mini-telephone companies." Col. 10, lines 3-10.

As such, *Archer* does not disclose that the server processor provides routing instructions to a circuit-switched network 130, 118. *Archer* clearly describes that a "phone call is routed to a find-me server processor 128 through a packet-switched network 130 (Step 104). For example, the call may reach the Internet via an Internet Service Provider (ISP)." Accordingly, voice signals from a circuit-switched network 118 are converted into digital packets by a converter and received by the service processor. *See* col. 5, lines 42-46 ("In general, converter 126 may convert signals from a first network (e.g., circuit-switched network 118) into a digital protocol which can be routed through packet-switched network 130"). At the service processor, "voice packets are then routed to the destination which responded to the call (Step 109). When the call is completed by an analog device 120 (e.g., a telephone), the digitized packets are reassembled by the converter 132 into a voice stream on the called party's end. When the call is completed to a digital device 134 (e.g., a computer) the digital device 134 itself (along with specialized software) reassembles the packets. At this point, the call is completed and conversation commences." *See* col. 9, lines 30-61 (Emphasis added).

Therefore, neither reference discloses that a central office queries a call-handling device which queries an internet call routing system, where the internet call routing system provides instructions to the call-handling device for routing the call. The call-handling device then uses the instructions to instruct the central office on how to route the call. Accordingly, the cited art fails to teach or suggest a "call-handling device coupled to the central office, the call-handling device operable to receive the query, and trigger an internet call routing query; [and] an internet call routing system coupled to the call-handling device, the internet call routing system being operable to receive the

internet call routing query, send a notification of the incoming call to the called party at a plurality of registered communication devices that the called party is detected to be present, the notification prompting the called party for instruction for handling the incoming call, in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and instruct the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time, wherein the call-handling device forwards the instructions from the internet call routing system to the central office," as recited in claim 1.

For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 2-6

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2-6 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims contain all the features of independent claim 1. *See In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Further, the cited art of *Cermak* and *Reding* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Archer* and *Pepper* references.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 2-6, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the references of record.

c. Claim 7

As provided in independent claim 7, Applicants claim:

> An internet call routing system, comprising:
> receive logic operable to receive a call query to a called party telephone number from a call-handling device via a gateway;
> call notification logic being operable to send a notification to the called party via a plurality of registered communication devices that the called party is detected to be present, the notification prompting the called party for instruction for handling the incoming call; and
> ***forwarding logic coupled to the call notification logic, the forwarding logic being operable to forward a call associated with the call query to the registered communication device in accordance***

with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and instruct the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 7 is allowable for at least the reason that *Archer* in view of *Pepper* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "forwarding logic coupled to the call notification logic, the forwarding logic being operable to forward a call associated with the call query to the registered communication device in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and instruct the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time," as recited and emphasized above.

For example, *Pepper* describes that "[i]n a second illustrative embodiment, the service control module 306 functionality is a main function in the IP 107 that is invoked by the SCP 105. This mapping may require a minimum of communications between the SCP and the IP, where the SCP is only involved at the start-up of the call. This mapping assumes that the IP can originate an outgoing call (to the subscriber and/or the subscriber's voice mail system, if this is a completely separate system) and to transfer the caller to the subscriber at the subscriber's request. Multiple IPs may be provided to support all of the system functions (e.g., one handling the client interactions and one handling the subscriber's interactions through his PDA)." Col. 8, lines 5-17 (Emphasis added).

Pepper does not teach or suggest "forwarding logic coupled to the call notification logic, the forwarding logic being operable to forward a call associated with the call query to the registered communication device in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and instruct the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time," as recited in claim 7.

Further, *Pepper* discloses "giving a single contact number to his clients" where the disclosed system connects a call for the single contact number, the call is answered by a TNI, and then may originate an outgoing call to another number. *See* col. 6, lines 12-17 and col. 8, lines 5-17. Likewise, *Archer* discloses a find-me system, where a caller dials a single telephone number. The call is then directed to a find-me service processor. Server processor routes call to a device via digitized packets over packet-switched network 130, whereby "This system also reduces switch traffic for the telephone companies by letting Internet service providers do the routing, in effect turning the Internet service providers into mini-telephone companies." Col. 10, lines 3-10.

As such, *Archer* does not disclose that the server processor provides routing instructions to a circuit-switched network 130, 118 within its disclosure. *Archer* clearly describes that a "phone call is routed to a find-me server processor 128 through a packet-switched network 130 (Step 104). For example, the call may reach the Internet via an Internet Service Provider (ISP)." Accordingly, voice signals from a circuit-switched network 118 are converted into digital packets by a converter and received by the service processor. *See* col. 5, lines 42-46 ("In general, converter 126 may convert signals from a first network (e.g., circuit-switched network 118) into a digital protocol which can be routed through packet-switched network 130"). At the service processor, "voice packets are then routed to the destination which responded to the call (Step 109). When the call is completed by an analog device 120 (e.g., a telephone), the digitized packets are reassembled by the converter 132 into a voice stream on the called party's end. When the call is completed to a digital device 134 (e.g., a computer) the digital device 134 itself (along with specialized software) reassembles the packets. At this point, the call is completed and conversation commences." *See* col. 9, lines 30-61 (Emphasis added).

Therefore, neither reference discloses or suggests, either individually or in combination, "forwarding logic coupled to the call notification logic, the forwarding logic being operable to forward a call associated with the call query to the registered communication device in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and instruct the call-handling device to route the call

to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time, as recited in claim 7.

For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

d. Claims 8-14

All of the claimed features of independent claim 7 are not taught and suggested by *Archer* and *Pepper*, as previously discussed. Further, the cited art of *Cermak, Reding*, and *Balasuriya* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Archer* and *Pepper* combination in suggesting or teaching all of the claimed features in claims 8-14 (which depend from respective independent claim 7). Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination has not been made, and the rejections of claims 8-14 should be withdrawn.

e. Claim 15

As provided in independent claim 15, Applicants claim:

> A method of providing intelligent interactive call handling, comprising:
>
> receiving a call query to a called party telephone number from a call-handling device via a gateway;
>
> sending a notification to the called party via a plurality of registered communication devices that the called party is detected to be present;
>
> ***generating a signal to initiate connection of the call to the registered communication device in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and***
>
> ***sending instructions to the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 15 is allowable for at least the reason that *Archer* in view of *Pepper* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "generating a signal to initiate connection of the call to the registered communication device in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and sending instructions to the call-handling device to route the call to

the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time," as recited and emphasized above.

For example, *Pepper* describes that "[i]n a second illustrative embodiment, the service control module 306 functionality is a main function in the IP 107 that is invoked by the SCP 105. This mapping may require a minimum of communications between the SCP and the IP, where the SCP is only involved at the start-up of the call. This mapping assumes that the IP can originate an outgoing call (to the subscriber and/or the subscriber's voice mail system, if this is a completely separate system) and to transfer the caller to the subscriber at the subscriber's request. Multiple IPs may be provided to support all of the system functions (e.g., one handling the client interactions and one handling the subscriber's interactions through his PDA)." Col. 8, lines 5-17 (Emphasis added).

Pepper does not teach or suggest "generating a signal to initiate connection of the call to the registered communication device in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and sending instructions to the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time," as recited in claim 15.

Further, *Pepper* discloses "giving a single contact number to his clients" where the disclosed system connects a call for the single contact number, the call is answered by a TNI, and then may originate an outgoing call to another number. *See* col. 6, lines 12-17 and col. 8, lines 5-17. Likewise, *Archer* discloses a find-me system, where a caller dials a single telephone number. The call is then directed to a find-me service processor. Server processor routes call to a device via digitized packets over packet-switched network 130, whereby "This system also reduces switch traffic for the telephone companies by letting Internet service providers do the routing, in effect turning the Internet service providers into mini-telephone companies." Col. 10, lines 3-10.

As such, *Archer* does not disclose that the server processor provides routing instructions to a circuit-switched network 130, 118 within its disclosure. *Archer* clearly describes that a "phone call is routed to a find-me server processor 128 through a

packet-switched network 130 (Step 104). For example, the call may reach the Internet via an Internet Service Provider (ISP)." Accordingly, voice signals from a circuit-switched network 118 are converted into digital packets by a converter and received by the service processor. *See* col. 5, lines 42-46 ("In general, converter 126 may convert signals from a first network (e.g., circuit-switched network 118) into a digital protocol which can be routed through packet-switched network 130"). At the service processor, "voice packets are then routed to the destination which responded to the call (Step 109). When the call is completed by an analog device 120 (e.g., a telephone), the digitized packets are reassembled by the converter 132 into a voice stream on the called party's end. When the call is completed to a digital device 134 (e.g., a computer) the digital device 134 itself (along with specialized software) reassembles the packets. At this point, the call is completed and conversation commences." *See* col. 9, lines 30-61 (Emphasis added).

Therefore, neither reference discloses or suggests, either individually or in combination, "generating a signal to initiate connection of the call to the registered communication device in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and sending instructions to the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time, as recited in claim 15.

For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn.

f. Claims 16-23

All of the claimed features of independent claim 15 are not taught and suggested by *Archer* in view of *Pepper*, as previously discussed. Further, the cited art of *Cermak*, *Reding*, and *Balasuriya* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Archer* in view of *Pepper* combination in suggesting or teaching all of the claimed features in claims 16-23 (which depend from respective independent claim 15). Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination has not been made. Therefore, the rejections of claims 16-23 should be withdrawn.

g. Claim 24

As provided in independent claim 24, Applicants claim:

> A computer readable medium having a program for providing intelligent interactive call handling, the program having instructions for performing:
>
> receiving a call query to a called party telephone number from a call-handling device via a gateway;
>
> sending a notification to the called party via a plurality of registered communication devices that the called party is detected to be present;
>
> ***generating a signal to initiate connection of the call to the registered communication device in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and***
>
> ***sending instructions to the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 24 is allowable for at least the reason that *Archer* in view of *Pepper* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "generating a signal to initiate connection of the call to the registered communication device in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and sending instructions to the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time," as recited and emphasized above.

For example, *Pepper* describes that "[i]n a second illustrative embodiment, the service control module 306 functionality is a main function in the IP 107 that is invoked by the SCP 105. This mapping may require a minimum of communications between the SCP and the IP, where the SCP is only involved at the start-up of the call. This mapping assumes that the IP can originate an outgoing call (to the subscriber and/or the subscriber's voice mail system, if this is a completely separate system) and to transfer the caller to the subscriber at the subscriber's request. Multiple IPs may be provided to support all of the system functions (e.g., one handling the client interactions and one handling the subscriber's interactions through his PDA)." Col. 8, lines 5-17 (Emphasis added).

Pepper does not teach or suggest "generating a signal to initiate connection of the call to the registered communication device in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and sending instructions to the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time," as recited in claim 24.

Further, *Pepper* discloses "giving a single contact number to his clients" where the disclosed system connects a call for the single contact number, the call is answered by a TNI, and then may originate an outgoing call to another number. *See* col. 6, lines 12-17 and col. 8, lines 5-17. Likewise, *Archer* discloses a find-me system, where a caller dials a single telephone number. The call is then directed to a find-me service processor. Server processor routes call to a device via digitized packets over packet-switched network 130, whereby "This system also reduces switch traffic for the telephone companies by letting Internet service providers do the routing, in effect turning the Internet service providers into mini-telephone companies." Col. 10, lines 3-10 (Emphasis added).

As such, *Archer* does not disclose that the server processor provides routing instructions to a circuit-switched network 130, 118 within its disclosure. *Archer* clearly describes that a "phone call is routed to a find-me server processor 128 through a packet-switched network 130 (Step 104). For example, the call may reach the Internet via an Internet Service Provider (ISP)." As such, voice signals from a circuit-switched network 118 are converted into digital packets by a converter and received by the service processor. *See* col. 5, lines 42-46 ("In general, converter 126 may convert signals from a first network (e.g., circuit-switched network 118) into a digital protocol which can be routed through packet-switched network 130"). At the service processor, "voice packets are then routed to the destination which responded to the call (Step 109). When the call is completed by an analog device 120 (e.g., a telephone), the digitized packets are reassembled by the converter 132 into a voice stream on the called party's end. When the call is completed to a digital device 134 (e.g., a computer) the digital device 134 itself (along with specialized software) reassembles the packets.

At this point, the call is completed and conversation commences." *See* col. 9, lines 30-61 (Emphasis added).

Therefore, neither reference discloses or suggests, either individually or in combination, "generating a signal to initiate connection of the call to the registered communication device in accordance with instruction from the called party that is received in reply to the notification; and sending instructions to the call-handling device to route the call to the called party telephone number if no instruction is received from the called party in reply to the notification after a set period of time, as recited in claim 24.

For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 24 should be withdrawn.

h. Claims 25-32

All of the claimed features of independent claim 24 are not taught and suggested by *Archer* in view of *Pepper*, as previously discussed. Further, the cited art of *Cermak*, *Reding*, and *Balasuriya* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Archer* and *Pepper* combination in suggesting or teaching all of the claimed features in claims 25-32 (which depend from respective independent claim 24). Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination has not been made. Therefore, the rejections of claims 25-32 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500